

[Mr. P. T. Rajan]

[30th October 1931]

amendments to Development Department Notification No. 278, dated 19th September 1928, published at pages 1455 to 1461 of Part I of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 25th September 1928, as subsequently amended:—

Amendments.

In paragraph 2 of Schedule II appended to the said notification—

- (i) *After the words ‘ from Villupuram to Trichinopoly both inclusive ’, the words ‘ from Cuddalore to Vriddhachalam both inclusive ’, and after the words ‘ from Trichinopoly to Erode both inclusive ’, the words ‘ from Sembatta and Chettinad to Parayankulam on the Trichinopoly-Manamadurai section ’ shall be inserted; and*
- (ii) *for the words ‘ from Salem junction to Salem town both inclusive ’, the words ‘ from Salem junction to Vriddhachalam both inclusive, from Salem junction to Mettur dam both inclusive ’ shall be substituted.’*

“ With a view to maintain the purity of cotton grown, the Province was divided into two areas and in order to prevent import of cotton from one area to another a notification was issued under paragraph 2 of Schedule II of the Development Department Notification, dated 19th September 1928. That notification states that cotton can be imported into the area only if the person holds a licence. Consequent on the opening of the new railway lines in the southern area it has been found necessary that these lines also should be included in the notification. This is a formal resolution and I hope the House will be pleased to pass it.”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“ I second it.”

The motion was put and carried.

XIV.—AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE IV OF THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

‘ That the following amendment to the provision made to determine the percentages of turnover of business transacted in the area of a municipality and published with Local Self-Government Department Notification No. 715 at pages 344-45 of Part I-A of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated the 14th April 1931, which the Governor acting with Ministers proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-rule (1) and sub-rule (2) of rule 18 of Schedule IV to the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920 (Madras Act V of 1920), be approved:—

That the words “ per annum ” occurring in the first and second items in column (1) of the schedule appended to the said provision be omitted.’

30th October 1931] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

“ The object of the amendment is that: under the District Municipalities Act and also under the Local Boards Act, there is a provision for the levy of what is called profession tax on business carried on by people and that levy is based upon the income of the business calculated at a certain percentage of turnover. There is a rule in the schedule to the Acts that the Legislative Council should approve of the principle on which the income should be assessed. This House gave approval to my proposal to fix the percentage on the turnover; in accordance with the approval of this House, the resolution has been published. But in the resolution it is stated that the turnover to be taken into consideration should be the turnover of the business during one year. But the provisions of the Act itself say that the tax should be levied on the turnover for a half-year and not on the basis of the whole year; therefore the turnover has to be calculated for each half-year separately. It has been pointed out by certain municipalities that this rule is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act itself. It is to avoid that inconsistency and to bring the rule into line with the Act itself that this amendment is moved. I therefore beg to move the motion.”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“ I second it.”

The motion was put and carried.

**XV.—AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE IV OF THE MADRAS LOCAL
BOARDS ACT, 1920.**

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

‘ That the following amendment in the provision made to determine the percentages of turnover of business transacted in the area of a local board and published with Local Self-Government Department Notification No. 717, at page 345 of Part I-A of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated the 14th April 1931, which the Governor acting with Ministers proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-rule (1) and sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of Schedule IV to the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Madras Act XIV of 1920), be approved:—

That the words “ per annum ” occurring in the first and second items in column (1) of the schedule appended to the said provision be omitted.’

“ I have already stated the reasons why the amendment is moved. This amendment relates to the Local Boards Act while the previous one relates to the District Municipalities Act.”

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—“ I second it.”

The motion was put and carried.